

In re Application of: Joy et al.
Application No.: 09/718,567

Remarks

In the application, claims 10 through 24, 26, and 27 are pending. No claims currently stand allowed.

The Final Office Action dated October 27, 2004, has been carefully considered. Claims 10 through 15, 19, 20, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,018,741 (“Howland”). Claims 16 through 18, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in light of Howland. Claims 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in light of Howland and U.S. Patent 5,970,496 (“Katzenberger”).

Applicants respectfully disagree that Howland anticipates all of the elements of claim 10. Specifically, claim 10 contains the element:

Claim 10: a third data field containing data representing *a location in source code* of a task.

(Emphasis added.) As described throughout the specification, this *location in source code* (usually noted in the specification by the variable LocID) is very useful in debugging. But Howland neither anticipates nor render obvious this element. In particular, the Final Office Action notes that Howland, in the code of column 9, lines 10 through 25, contains a pointer to “a location where the *runnable* portion of the task is located” (emphasis added). Source code, by definition, is never *runnable*. Instead of pointing back to the *source code*, Howland includes a pointer to a location in *executable* code. (Howland is using a well known technique, often found in device drivers.) Howland’s type of pointer is of course very useful, but cannot substitute for a pointer to a *location in the source code itself*, a pointer that helps a debugger track down a mistaken instruction.


Therefore, applicants respectfully submit that claim 10 and its dependent claims 11 through 24, 26, and 27 are patentable over the cited art.

In re Application of: Joy et al.
Application No.: 09/718,567

Conclusion

The application is considered in good and proper form for allowance, and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of the subject application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



John Bretscher, Reg. No. 52,651
One of the Attorneys for Applicants
LEYDIG, VOIT & MAYER, LTD.
Two Prudential Plaza, Suite 4900
180 North Stetson
Chicago, Illinois 60601-6780
(312)616-5600 (telephone)
(312)616-5700 (facsimile)

Date: December 17, 2004